

REMARKS

Claims 6, 16, and 27 are allowed. Claims 1, 11, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite. Claims 1, 11, and 22 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of January 3, 2008. We discussed a proposed amendment. Applicants agreed to make the amendment for claims 1, 11, and 22, and do so with this response.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 11, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 22 with the limitation that each module comprises executable code stored on a storage device and executed by a processor. As amended, Applicants submit that claims 1, 11, and 22 define a system/apparatus.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 11, and 22 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. As discussed above, Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 22 with the limitation that each module comprises executable code stored on a storage device and executed by a processor. As claims 1, 11, and 22 are directed to executable code stored on a storage device, Applicants submit that claims 1, 11, and 22 are statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

As a result of the proceeding remarks, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 1, 2008
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 322-1054